

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 29, 2012

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2011–12 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 1644

Introduced by Assembly Member Carter

February 13, 2012

An act to add Section 67840.8 to the Government Code, relating to redevelopment.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1644, as amended, Carter. ~~The California Military Base Reuse and Preservation Act of 2012.~~

The Military Base Reuse Authority Act authorizes cities and counties to establish an authority with specified powers and duties relating to the transition of a military base to civilian use; the Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act authorizes specified local agencies to establish the Fort Ord Reuse Authority; and existing law designates the local redevelopment authority recognized by the Department of Defense as the single local reuse authority for other specified military bases. *Existing law requires that the board of a military base reuse authority prepare, adopt, review, revise, and maintain a reuse plan that provides for the future use and development of territory of the former military base.*

Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies on February 1, 2012, and authorizes the designation of successor agencies to act as successor entities to the dissolved redevelopment agencies. Existing law provides for the continued application of specified provisions of law relating to redevelopment under specified circumstances.

This bill would enact the California Military Base Reuse and Preservation Act of 2012. The bill would make several legislative

findings and declarations relating to the granting of redevelopment powers to communities affected by federal military base closures ~~and declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation providing the option of a successor entity to areas affected by base closures and the deposit of funds to further redevelop activities in the affected area.~~

The bill would require that a reuse plan contain several elements relating to the economic, environmental, and low- and moderate-income housing impacts of the military base closure, as specified. In order to facilitate the implementation of these plan elements, the bill would authorize a reuse authority, through a transfer from the Department of Defense, to acquire and dispose of real property and other former military base assets adjacent to, or near, the former base.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. This act shall be known, and may be cited, as the
- 2 California Military Base Reuse and Preservation Act of 2012.
- 3 SEC. 2. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
- 4 (a) Since the Legislature first enacted legislation in 1989;
- 5 ~~Assembly Bill 409 of the 1998–89 Regular Session,~~ to address
- 6 military base closures in San Bernardino County, the Legislature
- 7 has adopted similar military base closure statutes to provide
- 8 redevelopment assistance to base closure reuse agencies for Fort
- 9 Ord, March Air Force Base, Hamilton Field, Mare Island, Tustin
- 10 Marine Corps Air Station, Alameda Naval Air Station, Castle Air
- 11 Force Base, Mather Air Force Base, McClellan Air Force Base,
- 12 and Norton and George Air Force Bases.
- 13 (b) The state has implemented a policy of granting additional
- 14 redevelopment powers to communities affected by federal military
- 15 base closures in furtherance of their need to redevelop and improve
- 16 military facilities that were conveyed to local communities and
- 17 other governmental and nonprofit organizations. Only through
- 18 these redevelopment efforts have the base closure communities
- 19 been able to begin to address many of the environmental and
- 20 physical deficiencies and other problems that remain on the former
- 21 military base properties after their closure.
- 22 (c) Extraordinary measures must continue to be taken to mitigate
- 23 the effects of the federal government’s efforts to reduce the number

1 of military bases throughout the country and, in particular, the
2 adverse economic impacts of military base closures within the
3 state. It is in the best interests of the state to continue to support
4 statutory provisions mitigating the economic and social degradation
5 that is faced by communities in jurisdictions that include military
6 bases that have been ordered to be closed or to be realigned by the
7 Federal Base Closure Commission.

8 ~~(d) It is the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that~~
9 ~~allows those areas affected by base closure to have a choice of a~~
10 ~~successor agency similar to the one established in Section 3173~~
11 ~~of the Health and Safety Code and that would allow funds to be~~
12 ~~deposited in the California Military Base Closure Fund to be used~~
13 ~~solely for the sole purpose of redeveloping the affected area.~~

14 *SEC. 3. Section 67840.8 is added to the Government Code, to*
15 *read:*

16 *67840.8. (a) The authority reuse plan specified in Section*
17 *67840 shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following*
18 *elements:*

19 *(1) An evaluation of the economic impacts of the base closure.*

20 *(2) An evaluation of the environmental impacts of the base*
21 *closure.*

22 *(3) An evaluation of the impacts upon low- and moderate-income*
23 *housing opportunities.*

24 *(4) An implementation plan and financial plan to address the*
25 *economic impacts of the base closure.*

26 *(5) An implementation plan to address the environmental*
27 *impacts of the base closure.*

28 *(6) A low- and moderate-income housing element for*
29 *implementation, as may be necessary.*

30 *(b) In order to facilitate the implementation of the plan elements*
31 *specified in subdivision (a), an authority may, through a transfer*
32 *from the Department of Defense, acquire and dispose of real*
33 *property and other former military base assets adjacent to, or*
34 *near, the former base.*